BOARD OF MANUFACTURED HOUSING DEPARTMENT OF FIRE, BUILDING AND LIFE SAFETY

RECEIVED

APR 01 2010

Fire, Building & Life Safety

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Phoenix, Arizona March 17, 2010 1:02 p.m.

PREPARED BY:

DOREEN C. BORGMANN, RMR, CRR Certified Reporter Certificate No. 50644

PREPARED FOR:

BOARD OF MANUFACTURED HOUSING DEPARTMENT OF FIRE, BUILDING AND LIFE SAFETY

(Original)



3030 North Central Avenue Suite 1102 Phoenix, Arizona 85012

T 602.264.2230 888.529.9990 F 602.264.2245

www.griffinreporters.com



Г			Page 2
1		AGENDA INDEX	
2	AGENDA I	TEM:	PAGE:
3	I.	Call to Order	5
4	II.	Roll Call	5
5		a. Introduction of Gene Palma, new	
6		Director of Department of Fire,	
7		Building and Life Safety	6
8	III.	Approval of Court Reporter Transcript	
9		and Abbreviated Minutes	8
10	IV.	Financial Report	
11		a. December 2009 Report as presented	
12		by the Deputy Director	8
13		b. Update on research into prior	
14		fiscal period for interest and	
15		educational grant payouts	17
16		c. Update on additional budget cut ar	nd
17		January 2010 reduction in force by	7
18		State Fire Marshal	18
19	٧.	Update on Legislative Bills presented	
20		by Director of Compliance	30
21	VI.	Fee Structure	
22		a. The Board shall establish a fee	
23	i.	scheduled before May 15 for the	
24		coming fiscal year	3 4
25			

Г			Page 3
1		AGENDA INDEX (CONTINUED)	-
2	AGENDA IT	EM: PA	AGE:
3		b. Annual update on 95/105 Percent	
4		Provision by Deputy Director	3.6
5	VII.	Recovery Fund	
6		a. Fund balance and pending claims and	
7		cash bond reconciliation update	
8		provided by Director of Compliance	69
9		b. Request to designate Ken Anderson,	
10		President of Arizona Housing	
11		Association, as an Interested Party	
12		on all Recovery Fund cases scheduled	Ŀ
13		for hearing at the Office of	
14		Administrative Hearings	69
15	VIII.	Bonding Requirements	7 9
16	IX.	Call to the Public	
17		By Ken Anderson	79
18		By Kara Holt	82
19	Х.	Announcements	8 4
20	XI.	Adjournment	87
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

ı	Page 4			
1	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, taken			
2	before the Board of Manufactured Housing, Department of			
3	Fire, Building and Life Safety Board Meeting held at			
4	1110 West Washington, Phoenix, Arizona, on the 17th day			
5	of March, 2010, commencing at the hour of 1:02 p.m. of			
6	the said day. The proceedings were reported by DOREEN			
7	C. BORGMANN, RMR, CRR, and a Certified Reporter in and			
8	for the County of Maricopa, State of Arizona.			
9				
10	BOARD MEMBERS:			
11	ROSS E. WAIT, Chairman ROBERT GIBB			
12	SAMUEL BAIRD CATHERINE McGILVERY			
13	PAUL DeSANCTIS ROGER WENDT			
14	NEAL HANEY			
15				
16	FOR THE DEPARTMENT:			
17	GENE PALMA BETH SOLIERE			
18	BOB BARGER MARYANN KNIGHT			
19	DEBRA BLAKE			
20				
21	ALSO PRESENT:			
22	KEN ANDERSON			
23	KARA HOLT			
24				
25				

```
Page 5
                    PROCEEDINGS
1
2
          CHAIRMAN WAIT: I'll go ahead and call the
   meeting to order. It's 1:02. And this is a nuclear
   watch, so I know it's correct. It's my Christmas
4
5
   present.
          MS. KNIGHT: Roll call. Sam Baird.
6
7
          MR. BAIRD: Here.
          MS. KNIGHT: Paul DeSanctis.
8
9
          MR. DeSANCTIS: Here.
10
          MS. KNIGHT: Robert Gibb.
11
          MR. GIBB: Here.
12
          MS. KNIGHT: Neal Haney.
13
          MR. HANEY: Here.
14
          MS. KNIGHT: Carlo Leone.
15
                Catherine McGilvery.
16
          MS. McGILVERY: Present.
17
          MS. KNIGHT: Joseph Stegmayer.
18
                Ross Wait.
19
          CHAIRMAN WAIT: Present.
20
          MS. KNIGHT: Roger Wendt.
          MR. WENDT: Here.
21
22
          MS. KNIGHT: And from the Department, we have Bob
23
   Barger.
2.4
          MR. BARGER: Here.
25
          MS. KNIGHT: Debra Blake.
```

MS. BLAKE: Here.

MS. KNIGHT: Deb Soliere. And Bob is going for introduce our new director.

MR. BARGER: I saw him go around and introduce himself. As you all know, we've had a change in some positions here over the past month. Been a month?

MR. PALMA: Seems like a year.

MR. BARGER: Gene Palma. He came to us from Weights and Measures. He's the new Director of the Department of Fire, Building and Life Safety. So he gets to try and corral Debra. I've been reassigned as the State Fire Marshal. And if all you remember when I came five years ago, that's what I was, the State Fire Marshall. And nine months later I was put into the Director's position under Governor Napolitano.

So as things will change, I had the opportunity with Gene coming over and Bill Mealey resigned as the State Fire Marshal -- or retired, I might say. He had enough time to retire -- that that gave an opening to for me to relocate into that position. And with the graces of the Governor and the office over there, they let me do that.

So it's been a good transition. We're still in transition. We've got a lot of things going on. I'm learning everything that Bill is doing for me,

Page 7

which is a lot. So, anyway, as we move forward, we look forward again to a great relationship, Gene and I and everybody. It's going great. We are having a very positive transition in this whole process.

MR. PALMA: I'm excited to be here. As you may have known, again, Bob just mentioned, I came over from Weights and Measures, was there approximately about a year. Before that, I spent six years with Governor Brewer when she was Secretary of State. I was the counsel for business issues there. So I am an attorney. Please don't hold it again me. Recovering.

So far I've enjoyed the challenges that have been presented to me here, and the people are outstanding. I don't know how they get done what they get done with the limited resources they have. I think you all, you know, should be thankful you have people like you have here and the staff working for you, because they're doing a great job. And I'm not just saying that. Because, you know, it's a tough task ahead.

But I'm excited about it. I am excited about all the issues that have come up before me and tackling those and working with you side by side. This is the first experience I've had in terms of working directly with a board. So bear with me. I may have

1 some missteps here and there, but I'm willing to learn. 2 I'm usually a quick learner, so I hope that's the case 3 here. But I just ask for your patience here and 4 consideration, and hopefully here in a short time I'll 5 get accustomed to the terminology, procedures, policies, 6 and so forth. And we'll work together and make it a 7 fruitful relationship. So I look forward to getting to 8 know each one of you individually as well as your 9 businesses. Thank you again. 10 CHAIRMAN WAIT: Thank you very much, Gene, and 11 look forward to a long-term relationship and changes 12 that need to take place within our industry. So thank 13 you. 14 All right. I would entertain a motion for 15 approval of the September 16, 2009, minutes, both the 16 transcript and the abbreviated minutes, please. 17 MR. WENDT: So move. 18 MR. DeSANCTIS: Second. 19 CHAIRMAN WAIT: Any discussion? All those in 20 favor, say, "Aye." 21 (All responded "Aye.") 22 CHAIRMAN WAIT: Any opposed? Thank you. 23 Next item on the agenda is the financial 24 reports. First item is the December, 2009, reports that 25 are presented to us by the Deputy Director.

Page 9

MS. BLAKE: That's contained in the packet that you have in front of you as well as what was sent to you to look at. I don't think there's anything unusual here. Of course, open it up to questions from you.

But the one item I did want to just briefly explain is the educational grant section at the very bottom there. The prior year interest for fiscal year '09-'10 looks like a typo, but it's not. We actually did have \$321,000 deposited into the Relocation -- excuse me -- Recovery -- let me get my funds straight -- into the Recovery Fund.

And over to the right, I made an attempt at explaining that. So you'll remember back a few Board meetings when we went through the whole -- we had a cash bond. And we went through a process of reconciling it. That initial effort at reconciling it identified interests that had been earned but had never been deposited into the Recovery Fund as the statutes require.

And that amount of money through the years had accumulated to \$303,160.50. So we got that lump sum distribution for that as well as the actual prior year interest, which was just over 18,000. So that explains that unusually high amount of money that was actually prior year interest during last fiscal year.

Any other questions or discussions about --1 Mr. Chairman. 2 MR. WENDT: Roger, please. 3 CHAIRMAN WAIT: So that's Recovery Fund money? MR. WENDT: 4 5 MS. BLAKE: It's Recovery Fund money. MR. WENDT: So what we thought was almost a 6 negative balance in the Recovery Fund is now 320,000 8 richer? 9 MS. BLAKE: Well, yes and no. MS. SOLIERE: I'm going to give you an update. 10 11 MS. BLAKE: Beth is going to give you an update 12 on that. 13 Do you want to do that now? MS. SOLIERE: At the time that money came to the 14 15 fund, we had so many outstanding claims that it was 16 literally there for a day, and we paid it out. So we've 17 continued to gain -- on the handout that I provided you 18 all with, on the bottom portion of it, you'll see that -- it's the one that says "Legislative Update" on 19 20 the top. 21 The current balance right now is 13,400. 22 We still have 12 claims pending, and five of those are waiting for hearing. And then you'll see that I 23 included the amount deposited for the past three months. 24 25 So it's around 10,000 that we're getting each month.

January was higher because I collected a \$25,000 bond. So we're still kind of in the same predicament that we were before, just waiting to try and pay people off.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Sam.

MR. BAIRD: Mr. Chairman, the seven that have gone through the hearing, what's the total amount of those claims?

MS. SOLIERE: Somewhere -- it's going to be over a hundred thousand dollars. There's a couple there for, I think, around 20. There's some that are pretty low. There's 400 and 800 and 500. And there's a couple in the teens. So --

MR. BAIRD: So as I understand it, we're paying them off by the date that --

MS. SOLIERE: That they filed. And the next person up is for one that's in around the \$20,000 ballpark. So as soon as this 13 gets up to 20, we'll pay her, and then we'll just keep going from there.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Roger.

MR. WENDT: Debra, excuse my ignorance. At some point this interest that came in from cash bonds that were paid in by dealers or contractors during the early part of this agency's life, is there still a balance of those there?

MS. BLAKE: Yes.

```
-Page 12 -
                      What happens? They continue to
1
          MR. WENDT:
2
   accrue interest?
          MS. BLAKE: Yes.
3
          MR. WENDT: A lot of these entities are long
4
5
   gone.
          MS. BLAKE: Yes. As long as they're maintained
6
   in a cash bond, they continue to accrue interest.
7
   think Beth -- I keep backing it to Beth. Beth's going
8
   to give an update shortly about --
9
10
          MR. WENDT:
                      Okay.
          MS. BLAKE: -- cash bond reconciliation and where
11
12
   we're at with that.
13
          MR. BAIRD: Okay. Thank you.
          MR. WENDT: This is on order -- so we're getting
14
   about 10 or 13,000 a month, and we owe a hundred. We've
15
16
   got about 13?
17
          MS. SOLIERE: Yes.
18
          MR. BAIRD: And then we've got about five more
19
   cases that are going --
          MS. SOLIERE: That are waiting for hearing. I
20
   would say there's probably two claims per month that are
21
   coming in right now. It's not a lot, but still some of
22
   them are pretty high. So --
23
24
          CHAIRMAN WAIT: So that has slowed down, the
   number of claims, substantially?
25
```

-Page 13 •

```
1
          MS. SOLIERE: It has a little bit, yes.
2
          MR. BAIRD: But we're going to get through that
3
   this year, and the next year, unless something happens,
   people aren't going to be waiting for their money, maybe
4
   two a month or --
6
          MS. SOLIERE: Yes.
7
          CHAIRMAN WAIT: Okay. Does that cover discussion
   on this December, 2009, report?
8
9
          MR. HANEY: Mr. Chairman?
          CHAIRMAN WAIT: Yes, Neal. It does not, I take
10
11
   it.
          MR. HANEY: I'm still having a little trouble
12
   with the education. Where do we get the numbers where
13
14
   it says 75 percent for education purposes? I know it
15
   comes from -- where do these -- for instance, it says in
   '09-'10, 13,000, 75 percent of --
16
17
          MS. BLAKE:
                      I'm not understanding.
18
          MR. HANEY: My understanding --
```

- 19 MS. BLAKE: Well, 75 percent of the remaining balance. 20
- 21 MR. HANEY: Remaining balance of -- okay. 22 the amount available for education purposes is 75 23 percent of the prior year's interest?
- 24 MS. BLAKE: Minus any expenditures. So if you look at that section, so the first column is the prior 25

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

year interest. So that's the total amount of interest that was earned.

MR. HANEY: Okay. So that's -- you know, I know I sound like I'm beating a dead horse. In '07-'08 we had interest of almost 16,000. 75 percent of that would have been almost 12,000.

MS. BLAKE: But you had 13,000 in expenditures.

MR. HANEY: Okay. But the amount of the interest that would have been available for education purposes is somewhere around -- just under 12,000; is that correct?

MS. BLAKE: No. It's the remaining balance. So you get the interest --

MR. HANEY: That's where you've lost me right there.

MS. BLAKE: Okay.

MR. HANEY: My understanding -- and I'll be happy to be corrected -- the amount that can be used for education purposes is 75 percent of the prior year's interest. And so if the prior year's interest is 15,600, 75 percent of that would be just under 12,000.

21 Is that not correct?

MS. BLAKE: Let me reread the statute real quickly if I can refer to it.

Okay. It says, "An amount not to exceed 75 percent of the previous fiscal year's interest earned on

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the Consumer Recovery Fund may be expended by the Director with the approval of the Board.

MR. HANEY: Correct. So if the prior year's interest is 15,679, 75 percent of that would be just under 12,000 that would be available for education purposes.

MS. BLAKE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: For '08-'09?

MR. HANEY: Yes. Because it says that the prior year's interest that was deposited or taken care of that was available for fiscal year '07-'08 is 15,679. 75 percent of that is just under 12,000. Unless they're mislabeled, I -- you see where I'm coming from? I'm not --

MS. BLAKE: I see where you're coming from.

MR. HANEY: And in '08-'09 the interest earned was 14,800. 75 percent of that --

MS. BLAKE: Okay.

MR. HANEY: -- is not -- is not 15,000.

MR. BARGER: Mr. Chairman, if I may intervene?

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Sure.

MR. BARGER: You're right, Neal. That's the way it should work out. But, again, with the payout, because this is all lump sum stuff that's in the Recovery Fund, so if that extra is there, we can use it

with the direction of the Board, the Director.

MR. HANEY: I understand that. And it's not that we're not going to approve anything.

MR. BARGER: Right.

MR. HANEY: But I'm just trying to come up with the accounting on how we're coming up with this.

MS. BLAKE: And I think you're right. The way it's represented here is confusing. In the effort to clear it up, it became more confusing. So you're right. I think what we need to add is a column that says, "Based on the prior year interest, 75 percent of it was available for education. Here's how much you used. Therefore, here's the remaining balance." Would that help clarify it?

MR. HANEY: As long as it's clear. Because at this point what it looks like is it says 75 percent for education purposes is 4,559. And that's a lot closer to 30 percent of the prior fiscal year. The next one says 15,000, and that's certainly more than 75 percent of the 14,000.

MR. PALMA: Are expenditures things that we pay out?

MS. BLAKE: No. Expenditures are grants approved.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: There seems to be an ongoing

debate regularly, Neal.

12 l

MR. HANEY: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: And I would appreciate it if we could get those so that it's very understandable. I think all the pieces are here, but what Neal is saying is correct. It's confusing. It doesn't flow properly. So whether that takes one column or two columns or whatever it takes, it should be set up so we can look at it and it makes sense to us.

MS. BLAKE: Perfect. What I will do is try to correct and clarify. And rather than wait for the next scheduled Board meeting --

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Just e-mail it to us.

MS. BLAKE: -- we'll e-mail this out to you.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Sure. Okay. Roger?

MR. WENDT: We're still on this report?

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Well, you know, the next item on the agenda is update on research in prior year for interest and educational grant payouts. So we're right on it.

MS. BLAKE: Yeah. And that's this handout that you should all have. At the last Board meeting, Neal had asked about an accounting for all the prior year interest. Central Services Bureau is who we use here to help with our accounting. So I contacted them. E-mail

is attached. And here is what they sent, which is on 2 the first page. 3 Basically, what she said is -- I'm just 4 paraphrasing -- it really wasn't tracked and recorded. 5 Therefore, she has no way of verifying prior year 6 interest prior to FY 08. And so you all remember Matt 7 Kennedy, who worked here with us before. He reported to 8 her that there was zero prior year interest on all years 9 before. So I think it was just -- it wasn't recorded, 10 documented. And at this point, this is the best, most 11 accurate information that we're going to be able to get. 12 MR. HANEY: At this point it's moot, because we 13 don't have any money to use for education programs 14 anyway.

MS. BLAKE: Yeah, it still needs to be right.

MR. HANEY: Yeah. It does. And if the information is not there, it's just not there. So --

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Did you have a comment?

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. WENDT: No. Pass for that one. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Okay. Any other discussion regarding educational funds? The interest earned therefrom from the Recovery Fund.

All right. Next item on the agenda is update on additional budget cuts and January 2010 reduction in force by State Fire Marshal.

-Page 19 -

MR. BARGER: We did have to implement a 15

percent cut, which was, because this is half a year,

seven and a half percent. That caused a reduction in

force of all the training sections, those three members

with the Fire Marshal's Office for fire fighter

training. We lost the fire research coordinator. We

lost our front staff.

And we had to close the Tucson office. So we don't have an administrative office out of the Tucson office anymore. However, because of the way things are set up in State budgeting, we have to continue to pay rent on the office space in Tucson. So the inspectors are still working out of the office, but it's not an office open for permitting or anything else out of that office.

So what happened is we thought we were going to be able to get out of that. We weren't able to get out of that because there's still money owed on that building to the State. The only way we can get out of that, if you are interested, is to find somebody to come in behind us and rent it from us. So we couldn't get out of the rent. We still have to pay the \$90,000 on that.

Same thing with the building that we're currently in. We can't get out of this unless we get

somebody to come in and pay the rent behind us.

So it was a considerable cut and reduction in force with the additional seven and a half percent.

Just kind of briefly what's coming up, I don't know if you've all been following the legislative budget process. In that budgeting process, it actually eliminates the Department of Fire, Building, and Life Safety from the General Fund.

So in that respect, what we've kind of found out was elimination from the General Fund doesn't mean that we would be stand-alone or go on our own, or Fire Marshal's Office or anything else. It looks like it would be a move to dissolve the Department of Fire, Building, and Life Safety.

As you all know, there's a lot of the issues on that when it comes to the statutes and all the other things on what the office does for the industry through the impact through the whole program, through HUD and through the relocation.

So we sent over some information through

Gene over exactly what we do and what the cost was, what
is this office mandated to do by statute. On the Fire

Marshal's side the only thing we're mandated to do is
provide public education, fire and safety education to
the schools, and inspect the schools, State and County

buildings.

On the manufactured housing side, you're required to do the FPM. And then there's that separation between the HUD standard issues and then the modulars. And some are State-regulated. Some are HUD standard homes regulated through HUD. So we sent over that separation, said this is everything that we do that's mandated in the statute.

Our continuing efforts are dependent upon the May 18 vote, the one cent tax increase. If that does not pass, then I suppose we would have to get together and say, "How do you dissolve this department and all its functions?" Do you send it somewhere else? The Fire Marshal's Office. Personally I don't know how you give it to the Fire Marshal, I guess because I am one. But it's just one of those things.

We would be the first state, obviously, in the United States that does not have a State Fire Marshal's Office. So you look at all those things, at the county, local jurisdictions, how do those things transpire? How do you transpire what Office of Manufactured Housing does as far as dealing with HUD and all the plan reviews and everything that the Office of Manufactured Housing does and all the things that we do through the Office of Administration for licensing and

Page 22

legal issues and all those sorts of things. So how do you -- I mean, you just take the departments that no longer exist.

As you all well know, the -- so if it doesn't pass, that's what we have to go for. If it passes, we can remain intact. So they kind of put that umbrella over us a little bit. And if it passes, though, I will share with you that we are still going to experience an additional cut in next year's budget. And we were currently at 12,185,000. We will be reduced to 2,007,000. I'm sorry. We will be reduced to 2,007,000, which could transpire into additional cuts. All we have left pretty much are the inspectors and people.

So either way, it's not going to be pretty for us. If it doesn't pass, it's going to be -- we'll all have to, I guess, have an emergency meeting and figure out what's going to happen here. Because a lot of what the Office of Manufacturing Housing does takes direction from this Board on those kind of issues as far as fees and how this is all going to work. So we're just kind of -- actually, we're just kind of in limbo really. We're processing things, obviously, but we have to wait and see what the vote is on May 18 on whether that one cent tax increase is going to pass or not.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Roger.

Page 23

MR. WENDT: Thank you, Bob. It's my perception at this point, at least, that that one cent sales tax is going to pass. I'm not real concerned yet. But, yeah, it does concern me that the whole apple cart will get upset, and we'll have to figure out which way to go. I think there's probably some things we could live without. But it's a lot of them that we've become pretty used to. It's good for the industry. So kind of like the rest of us, just one day at a time to see if this business succeeds or not.

MR. BARGER: Exactly. Again, as you all know, being in the business, things are way down and those kinds of things, and it's going to be a while before it turns around. Even if it starts to turn around right now, it's going to take a while for all that to come back before you can actually say we're on the road to recovery. So that's the doom and gloom of the budget update.

And it's pretty amazing, all that's going on in there. As you all know, the Department of Juvenile Corrections was tasked -- was possibly going to be eliminated, pushed down to the County level. They have a one-year reprieve on that. It's still not out of the ballpark. It's going to happen, just not happen this year.

Tax increase -- Gene, I think this is correct. If the tax increase doesn't pass, we're looking at a July 1, 2010, date of not being in existence anymore.

MR. PALMA: Possibility, yes.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: You're saying OMH, Fire Marshal gone?

MR. BARGER: Correct. Now, obviously, we will try to have some input on that. It's hard to just eliminate those two departments for what they do to the State because there's so much in the statute for what we do. So you look at that, or you look at, well, you put this office here and this office here, one of the different sections. I don't know. That's something we'll have to get together and discuss after the May 18 vote.

MR. PALMA: I just want to clarify. If the sales tax fails, the likelihood of the structure remaining as it is in terms of Office of Manufactured Housing and Fire Marshal and administrative side of it remaining as it is today is highly unlikely. Just simply the numbers telling you it's not going to fit.

Having said that, I'm sure that -- again, that is my personal opinion. I'm sure, simply because from a legal perspective, there are so many statutory

duties that are required of all three divisions that they would most likely again be probably relocated in some other fashion in another area. So you can't really say that we would stop existing. But there would be some changes, obviously, because the numbers don't match up. And the Department of Fire, Building and Life Safety would not continue as it is structured today. It's just not simply economically possible or feasible.

But, again, once that happens, if it does not pass, and they have about six weeks to consider all options, and there's a number of options out there. But at that point in time, we're going to have to sit down and review all those. I don't want to sit here and -- it's all conjecture at this point. But that's what it is at this point in time.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Sam.

MR. BAIRD: When are you expecting to hear back from the Attorney General's Office as to the mandated issues? Somewhere before --

MR. PALMA: Well, it actually didn't go to the Attorney General's Office. It actually was sent to the Governor's Office just to give them heads up as to what is out there in terms of statutorily required duties from the existing departments. So that way they can prepare -- again, in case the sales tax is not passed,

they can prepare some kind of contingency plans and proceed from there.

But there really isn't a response expected. It's just a matter of, again, on May 19, we'll know a lot more as to what can and can't happen and what options are available. And at that time, obviously, we'll let you know as soon as we know how the Governor's office will proceed.

MR. BAIRD: Okay. Just to follow up, Bob, you mentioned looks like about a 20 percent decrease in the budget would be happening.

MR. BARGER: 2.5.

MR. BAIRD: 2.5, 2.0. As you know, the businesses today, the entities, would they be able to operate through the current guidelines at that rate?

MR. BARGER: It depends on where the cuts would be. Obviously, it's all people, and all we have left are inspectors on both sides.

MR. BAIRD: Right.

MR. BARGER: So it would be very difficult. Now, the Fire Marshal's side, it's in the statute that you will do a regularly scheduled inspection of. Regularly scheduled is dependent on whatever. Nationally, it was annually. But people aren't able to do that anywhere nationally anymore. Regularly scheduled could be every

five years to inspect a school.

The other side of it, however, is based on business and permitting and the issue of what's being built in the factories, plants, and things, what's being delivered and set up and installed. So that's an issue of if that business picks up and you've cut -- currently, you only have three in-plant inspectors now. If that business picks up real fast, then what we've discussed will actually become a bottleneck for the industry because we can't keep up with it.

And we've talked a little bit with Scott
Butler about those issues, too, about our inability to
inspect them as they're being built and then get
inspectors out in a timely manner to inspect an
installation. Because what makes the industry thrive,
obviously, is getting them built and getting people in
their house quickly.

MS. BLAKE: And I would say that what we've done internally, even though we've had severe cuts, is to really move forward with some cross-training. Because we've cross-trained two additional inspectors to be able to support the inspection and manufacturing facilities so that we are prepared. And the same way taking some of those folks and training them on the installation side of it so that we are prepared. Because we do not

want to impede any production, shipping, whatever that needs to happen once things start to pick up.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Sort of amazing. Been in this industry a long time and on this board probably 14 years. I guess we're down to the last 15 seconds of the game, and we're relying on a one percent Hail Mary pass. Huh?

MR. HANEY: That's about it.

MR. BARGER: So unless there's any further questions, we'll just have to, again, wait and see what happens on the 18th.

MR. WENDT: One thought, I guess. It would seem to me, though, that by encouraging more intergovernmental agreements with local, etcetera, we could figure out a way to adjust.

MR. BAIRD: As far as inspections?

MR. WENDT: Yeah. Take some weight out of the field inspections, try to get the IGA's to pick those up and then concentrate on the, you know, office stuff for you. You're going over plans, and it's been hard. You can't plan inspections. I think our industry group is certainly willing to help with that, encourage those locals to get on board with that. So even worst case scenario, we'll get through it.

MR. BAIRD: We were told, Mr. Chairman, that the

IGA's are inspecting anyway. They're going to the same sites, only looking at parts of setups, not some of the things that y'all are inspecting as well. So they could be handled by one source in certain areas of the state for sure. So that would eliminate your drain on manpower, also drain on your budget and income.

MS. BLAKE: Yes.

MR. BAIRD: Needs to be a balance there.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: But I assume those counties or cities that do not have the IGA relationship, what happens then? They either pick it up or homes don't go there, go to those jurisdictions?

MR. BARGER: If, in fact, the tax doesn't pass?

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Correct.

MR. BARGER: The department somehow shifted responsibility somewhere else? I don't know.

MS. BLAKE: Well, then you get the oversight of HUD. Because HUD has, as you know, last year enacted their installation program. But I can tell you in very candid conversations with HUD for those default states that they have that oversight now, they don't have the resources to do any inspections. So all they're doing is the back end of it, responding to complaints they receive.

And those HUD-mandated -- the states that

HUD has oversight on, installers that live in those counties or do work there have to post a \$1,000,000 bond with the feds to insure any complaints that they might get. And pretty much -- I can't speak for Roger, but pretty much most of the installer licensee base we have could not come up with a \$1,000,000 -- assets for a \$1,000,000 bond. Just not going to happen. And so then you just create chaos because you have unlicensed people doing work and nobody really inspecting. So --

MR. BARGER: And that's on the HUD side. On the FBD side, which is State-regulated through IRC and IBC, that would be pushed down to local jurisdictions to figure out how to do that.

MS. BLAKE: Right.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Okay. Any other discussions regarding this topic?

All right. Next item on the agenda is update on legislative bills presented by the Director of Compliance.

MS. SOLIERE: If you would all please refer back to the handout.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Yeah.

MS. SOLIERE: House Bill 2058 titled Residential Landlord Maintenance and Repair, the reason that I'm updating on this, originally, it was entitled Mobile

13 l

Home Parks Maintenance and Repair. Early on in the process, the bill was amended. Mobile home parks were taken out. And now it deals mainly with apartment complexes.

Escrow Account. Currently, this bill has passed through the House of Representatives. And it's in the Senate waiting for a committee, the Senate Commerce and Economic Development Committee. So it's waiting to be put on an agenda within the next few weeks probably. We've also developed a task force to address writing the escrow instructions, and we're planning to meet here within the next couple of weeks.

MR. WENDT: Who's on that task force?

MS. SOLIERE: There's about 10 people. They're from all different industries.

MR. WENDT: You don't have them memorized?

MS. SOLIERE: No. Dealers, routers, someone from banking, someone from AAMCO. I can provide you with a list if you like.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: The title industry?

MS. SOLIERE: Yes.

MR. WENDT: They should be well represented since they are a part of putting it together.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: So would that replace the

Recovery Fund, in essence?

MS. SOLIERE: I believe it would replace only on homes sold over \$50,000. So under 50,000, it can still go through Recovery Fund.

Next is House Bill 2446. That's titled Alarm Business and Agents. If this bill passes, it would require our department to license alarm businesses and their agents. The reason I'm updating on this is because just to inform you that it's a possible increase in work load for our department. Currently, the bill is through the House, and it's waiting to be assigned to committee in the Senate. Hasn't been assigned yet.

MR. HANEY: This is for a department that may not be here.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Yeah.

MS. SOLIERE: And then lastly is the budget bills, which Bob and Gene both already talked about. These bills passed through both the House and the Senate last week. So they're on their way to the Governor's Office. And like Bob said, you know, we're dependent on the sales tax passing in May.

MR. BAIRD: I'm a little unclear on that. It was the Senate that said if it doesn't pass, we're out or was it --

MS. SOLIERE: It's both. Senate Bill 1001 and 1 House Bill 2001 are the same. They both had a provision 2 that if the sales tax doesn't get passed, our agency is 3 off the General Fund. And then House Bill 2004 and 4 5 Senate Bill 1004 coincide with that to say that whatever is left after they cut us by almost two million dollars, 6 that the Director of the department, it's at his 7 discretion to decide what duties to continue on with. 8 It's about, like, \$70,000 remaining. And then from that 9 point forward, we would be off the General Fund. CHAIRMAN WAIT: Roger, redefine from here, if you 11 will. 12 MR. WENDT: So how much of our annual budget is 13 reliant on the General Fund. 14 15 MS. BLAKE: We're going to talk about that next. MR. WENDT: Okay. 16 CHAIRMAN WAIT: I believe I read a comment the 17 Governor made -- correct me if I'm wrong. I think she 18 said that if all State employees were laid off, we'd 19 20 still have a deficit. 21 MR. PALMA: Right. 22 CHAIRMAN WAIT: Does that put it into 23 perspective? Yes. To clarify, it was the 24 MR. BARGER: 25 legislative budget that eliminates the office, not the

executive budget.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Okay. Any need for further discussion regarding these House bills or legislative updates?

Next item, fee structure. The Board shall establish a fee schedule before May 15 for the coming fiscal year. And I know up until at least last meeting there was a moratorium on fees. Has that since been removed or --

MS. BLAKE: It's not been removed to my knowledge. But our director would be able to make -- or any director -- make a request for an exception to it.

MR. PALMA: Right. You can request an exemption from the moratorium. So that -- because this is based on a statutory requirement, I don't anticipate an issue being granted the exemption. Of course, I've seen other issues which have come up. But, again, because it is statutorily required, I don't see a problem being granted an exemption.

MR. WENDT: And these -- this fee schedule that we adopt goes into -- would go into effect July 1.

MS. BLAKE: Correct.

MR. WENDT: So then we'd have to adapt. We have to do it by May 15. The one cent sales tax vote isn't until the 19th. It's a little bit of a conundrum. We

13 l

2.4

should either set these fees based on the assumption that the one cent sales tax will pass or will not pass.

MS. BLAKE: Well, I think the other point to be made is that you establishing fees doesn't require a rule change. Because the rules say you establish them. It doesn't set what they are except for the bond amounts. And so we wouldn't have to have any rule changes. We would just ask for an exception because the Governor didn't want cost to consumers to increase. So it's not as challenging as getting a rule package together and getting it through that process.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: So if there were a fee increase, it would have to be subject to obtaining the exemption?

MS. BLAKE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: And number two, subject to passage of the one percent sales tax?

MR. PALMA: No. The one percent sales tax is a separate issue.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: I understand. But if the agency doesn't exist after that, then what's the use? That's what I'm saying.

MS. BLAKE: Right.

MR. PALMA: Well, the agency may cease to exist as we know it today, but the Office of Manufactured Housing --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Might be somewhere else.

MR. PALMA: -- could continue to operate. And, therefore, your fees still continue.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Got you. All right. That point is well taken.

MS. BLAKE: So Mr. Chairman and Board, this last packet of information that you have in your handouts, I wanted to share with you the information in here so that you can discuss the fee structure.

I also wanted to provide you with the annual update on the statutory requirement that we operate within a 95 to 105 percent provision. And so on the first page, and then we'll get into more detail, I just put it there for information. But as long as --

CHAIRMAN WAIT: This page? This page or this page? Okay. This one.

MS. BLAKE: Yeah. Your actual fee schedule is in your agenda packet on the last page. This is a separate handout.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Can we go to this one?

MS. BLAKE: This is the one I want to go to.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: We do not have a problem with that 105 million coming in.

MS. BLAKE: Yeah. Obviously, those calculations are incorrect. That's what was reported to you as part

Page 37 ·

of the June, 2009, end of fiscal year 2009. And they're just not right.

so in working with Central Services Bureau and making sure that we're communicating and both on the same page, in this packet is your financial report for 2010, January. And where we sit right now, we're operating at an 89 percent rate. You can see that fees are lower than expenditures. And so by statutory requirement, we're going to have to -- or you're going to have to entertain adjusting that. We have to get that to a minimum of 95.

So when I played with the numbers a little bit and tried to figure out, make some recommendations to you for you to consider, in the last box at the bottom, if we raise fees pretty much right across the board 15 percent -- and I have the charts in here -- it gets us to this last block of information. And it gets us to 98 percent.

your question, 98 percent the fees that we collect -- or of the fees that we collect pays 98 percent of our expenses. So we collect enough fees even in this -- with the fee increase that we can support all the expenses of OMH. Now, this is just OMH. We can support 98 percent of the expenses.

MR. BAIRD: So we would only be asking for, like, 15 grand from the General Fund?

MS. BLAKE: Whatever that calculates out to.

MR. BAIRD: Two percent.

MS. BLAKE: Or we do some more adjustments to get it down to where we are a hundred percent self-supporting. All the fees cover all the expenses. And so in the next page in that packet, I provided you the January report. The first one as it sits today, which shows the 89.2 percent, which is where we are with the fee structure the way it currently sits. Everyone have that? So I added to the far side the 89.20 percent, which is where we're at.

The next page of that is exactly what I went over with you. If we do a 15 percent across the board fee increase, then that changes that proration to 97.5 percent. Round it up to 98. Do you have everything you need there, Ross?

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Oh, just give me a second. Yep.

MS. BLAKE: Got you.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Have it now.

MS. BLAKE: So what that equates to is in -sorry you have so many papers here. But the last chart,
which is my recommendation to you on the fee increase,
is a two-page document, and it looks like this.

```
MR. BARGER: It's on the back of your colored --
1
2
          CHAIRMAN WAIT: Got it.
          MS. BLAKE: So that lists all of the fees, shows
3
   you what the current fee is, shows you the
4
   recommendation for increase, and shows you what the new
5
   fee would be. So licensing fees go up. Renewal fees
   for licensing goes up. For an example, installation
7
   permit for a manufactured home currently is at $120 for
8
   the permit. Would go up to $180. Currently, the local
9
   jurisdictions that are in under governmental agreements
10
   with us are charging 200, because that's the max. So we
11
12
   would --
13
          MR. BAIRD:
                      So 150 percent?
                      120 to 180 is a 50 percent increase.
14
          MR. HANEY:
                      I'll check that calculation.
          MS. BLAKE:
15
                      Should be 138.
16
          MR. BAIRD:
                          Yeah.
                                 138.
1.7
          CHAIRMAN WAIT:
18
          MS. BLAKE:
                      Thank you.
          MR. BAIRD:
19
                      The intent was to go 15 percent.
                            The intent was to go 15
20
          MS. BLAKE:
                      Yes.
   percent. The only exceptions to that are on that first
21
   page, and that is making a 25 percent increase for
22
23
   commercial factory-built buildings where they would go
24
   from $4.00 per linear feet to $5.00 per linear foot.
```

MR. BAIRD: And the rationale there?

25

MS. BLAKE: It's considerably less than what the local jurisdictions are charging. And the only other exception, I think, is in the mobile home rehabilitation permit. And the rationale for lowering this by 50 percent is the population of people that are coming to us to have to rehabilitate a home pre-HUD standards, 1976 units, seem to really struggle with being able to come up with that permit fee. They're very -- the population is under the poverty level typically. And so if we can help that population a little bit and still get to where we need to go.

MR. HANEY: If they're under the poverty level, isn't there funds available through the Relocation Fund to cover that?

MS. BLAKE: We reimburse them for the cost of bringing it to Code, up to \$1,000. We don't give them any consideration on getting the permit, which is required to then start the rehabilitation process. So they don't get the permit fee back. They just get up to \$1,000 for the cost of the materials of bringing it up to Code.

So these are just suggestions for you.

MR. BARGER: One additional thing on that, on the rehabilitation. That's out-of-pocket expense to get it fixed and then submit receipts to recover those funds.

So --

CHAIRMAN WAIT: So I guess my question is is this something for us to think about, or are you anticipating us voting on this today?

MS. BLAKE: You could do it either way, Mr. Chairman. If you decide to consider it, you would have to call for a special Board meeting prior to May 1, because, remember, the statutory limitation.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: I understand that.

MS. BLAKE: So --

MR. HANEY: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Yes, Neal.

MR. HANEY: Could I ask a couple of questions?

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Certainly may.

MR. HANEY: Thank you. Some time ago we had talked about when we were looking at fees, I think last year and probably the year before that, about having some people break down on where our expenses were incurring in relation to the income derived from that. For instance, is half of the budget on factory inspections, and how much more income then comes from factory fees. Did we ever do anything with that as far as a labor distribution cost analysis, that kind of thing?

MR. BARGER: No, we didn't.

```
Page 42 -
          MS. BLAKE: We haven't. I think that was before
1
2
   my time.
                      It's been twice in the last two
3
          MR. HANEY:
4
   years.
          MS. BLAKE: Oh, okay.
5
6
          MR. HANEY: Also. When you look at -- when
7
   you're giving us these expenditures here of -- or
   projected expenditures of $756,000, is there any part --
   I know at one time the discussion said that a portion of
9
   the office administration -- and I forget the
1.0
   percentage, something like 60 percent -- was allocated
11
   as part of this. Is that true with this?
12
          MS. BLAKE: I think the portion is about 30
13
14
   percent, and yes.
          MR. HANEY: So this, in essence, this 756,510, is
15
   the anticipated cost of running the Office of
16
   Manufactured Housing, all of its related functions, and
17
18
   a portion of the administrative cost that's in the
   offices -- Office of -- what is that? Administration?
19
20
          MS. BLAKE: Yes.
                      So that's the total cost.
21
          MR. HANEY:
22
          MS. BLAKE: It's the total cost of operating OMH
   functions.
23
          CHAIRMAN WAIT: And that's for 2010-11?
24
                      I'm sorry? I'm not sure --
25
          MS. BLAKE:
```

```
MR. BARGER: Is this calendar or fiscal?
1
2
         MS. BLAKE: Oh, it's fiscal.
          CHAIRMAN WAIT:
                          So for 2010-11?
3
                             July 1 through June 30.
4
         MR. BARGER: Yes.
          CHAIRMAN WAIT: Is that assuming this additional
5
   cut you've talked about?
6
7
          MS. BLAKE:
                      It does not include that cut. If, in
   fact, that cut came from the OMH part of the
8
   department -- and it's likely that it would -- that does
9
10
   not reflect that in the expenditures.
                      If we're covering our costs through
11
          MR. HANEY:
12
   fees anyway, I don't see how that plays into it then.
13
          MS. BLAKE: Well, except that the expenditures
14
   would come down. But then --
15
          CHAIRMAN WAIT: Just, for instance, let's say
   this next year you're talking -- I don't know -- seven
16
17
   percent or ten percent reduction for fiscal year
   2010-11. Maybe it takes a hundred thousand dollars
18
   making that up. So no rate increase would be necessary
19
   to meet the 95 to 105 is all I'm saying.
20
                      Okay. I understand that. But none
21
          MR. HANEY:
   of this has anything to do with the general budget.
22
23
          CHAIRMAN WAIT: No.
24
          MR. HANEY: So regardless of what they say, what
   we're looking at is coming up, matching revenue to the
25
```

Page 44 actual cost. 1 MS. BLAKE: Yes. 2 MR. HANEY: And I guess my follow-up question to 3 that is my understanding is that, with the blessing of 4 the Tenants Association and the Governor's Office, 5 there's \$900,000 a year being taken out of the 6 Relocation Fund. Where does that come into play in 7 this? 8 The relocation fee, the part of it 9 MS. BLAKE: that supports the administrative cost of it is reflected 10 11 in this expenditure. 12 MR. HANEY: Okay. But where is the income 13 derived from pulling funds out of the relocation fund reflected in this? As far as the moneys that we use to 14 offset the indirect and direct costs, I'm not sure where 15 16

it's placed in this. But again, it's -- I don't know if --

MS. BLAKE: It's considered here, Neal, because the --

Okay. Where? MR. HANEY:

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The expenditures -- it's not MS. BLAKE: reflected on what I gave you.

What I'm saying is you're saying we MR. HANEY: have an estimated annual expenditures of \$756,000.

> MS. BLAKE: Right.

MR. HANEY: That covers the total cost of operation operating the Office Was Manufactured Housing and portion of the cost of the Office Was Administration and basically everything the department does.

MS. BLAKE: Yes.

MR. HANEY: Okay. At the same time, there is an

MR. HANEY: Okay. At the same time, there is an amount of money being pulled from the Relocation Fund --

MS. BLAKE: Correct.

MR. HANEY: -- for this department to use.

MS. BLAKE: Yes.

MR. HANEY: Somewhere around \$900,000, which more -- which is more than the estimated annual expenditures. That's what I'm trying to see where that is.

MS. BLAKE: If you look in the very top box up here that was incorrectly calculated with the fees, that figure of annual expenditures, which is about \$950,000, that includes what you're talking about with the Relocation Fund. When we pull out --

MR. HANEY: The expenses to administer that, yes.

MS. BLAKE: When we put out about 100,000 -- \$200,000, which are what we take out of the Relocation Fund to support some of the costs of OMH, that's how we get it down to the 756.

MR. HANEY: Okay.

```
MS. BLAKE: So about 200,000 comes out of
1
   relocation to support the expenses of OMH specifically.
2
                      I'm sorry. I must have misread.
3
          MR. HANEY:
   thought I saw an audit not too long back that said
4
5
   $900,000 came out of it. Am I incorrect?
         MS. BLAKE: No. You did see $900,000. That was
6
   at the high level department level. These figures are
7
8
   strictly for OMH. Not that much money comes out of
   Relocation Fund -- I mean, it's a lot of money, 200
   grand -- specifically for OMH. So that's what these
10
   numbers reflect.
11
          MR. HANEY: Okay. I quess I'm just a little
12
13
   dense.
          MR. BARGER: The rest of relocation comes out of
14
   the Compliance Manager's position and the Office of
15
16
   Administration --
          MR. HANEY: Okay. Then I'm hearing --
17
          MR. BARGER: -- and the hearing function.
18
          MR. HANEY: The discussion we just had said that
19
   all of the costs related to the department are reflected
20
21
   in this 756,000.
          MS. BLAKE:
                      No. All of the costs --
22
                      I'm sorry. I thought that's --
23
          MR. HANEY:
24
          MS. BLAKE: -- related to OMH.
                      And the Office of Administration.
25
          MR. HANEY:
```

Page 47 -MS. BLAKE: No, not all of the costs for Office 1 2 of Administration. MR. HANEY: Not all of the costs, no, but those 3 that have to do with what the department deals with. 4 MS. BLAKE: Those that have to do with what the 5 Office of Manufactured Housing deals with. For example, 7 when we get a change in use when a park is closing, we send OMH inspectors to the park. 8 MR. HANEY: I understand. I know how the process 9 10 works. MS. BLAKE: And we pay their salary out of the 11 12 Relocation Fund for that. So that comes out of 13 relocation. It doesn't get put per se back into the fees because it's not a fee we collect. But it reduces 14 the amount of expenditures. 15 MR. HANEY: I'm just going to tell you right up 16 front. I have no confidence in these numbers at this 17 point. I just don't. 18 19

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Roger.

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. WENDT: I would suggest by movement, Mr. Chairman, that we have a special meeting before May 1 to review these fees.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: That's my sense also.

MR. WENDT: Make that a motion, please.

I think we need to be confident CHAIRMAN WAIT:

And I think that some of these questions that Neal has raised as well as some thought process, and I realize we're not going to know prior to May 15, because the vote is on May 19, how that might impact the department.

Before we do that, Roger has a motion. Is

there a second?

MR. BAIRD: I second.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Any discussion?

MR. HANEY: Can I amend the motion? I'd like to move to amend the motion to include the numbers, the actual cost of what has been used to -- for the relocation and the moneys that have been taken out of the Relocation Fund in relation to that.

MR. WENDT: I think that should be a second motion.

MR. HANEY: Okay. I'll withdraw the amendment.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Okay. So we have a first and a second. Any discussion?

MR. WENDT: And here's some of my rationale for this. That I'm a little frustrated, like Neal, that I don't understand what we've got going here, where the money's coming from, where it's going. I'm having a little bit of a hard time with voting for just a flat across-the-board 15 percent increase on everybody

without more information.

2.4

And, you know, we don't do your job, and it is your job to make sure this all fits in a box and everything's done properly. But I'd just like some assurance that we're not -- don't have a little waste here or there. And before I go to the people that I represent, all the installer's industry, and say, "Hey, we just had to do it." I guess that's my rationale for that motion, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: And a point of question, a thought I have, anyway, is I would like to see a breakdown of what that, in this case, 956,000. So if it remains the same prior or at the next meeting, by the next meeting, I would like a breakdown of that figure so we have an understanding what that 956 consists of. That number might go up or down between now and then.

Any further discussion regarding the motion on the floor? All in favor say "Aye."

(All responded "Aye.")

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Any opposed? Carries the same. Thank you.

Now, did you want a separate motion, Neal?

MR. HANEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would

make a motion that all expenses and all income covered

under this Office of Manufactured Housing, the Office of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Administration, i.e., everyone delineated in this department, that affects the income and expenses be included in the totals that were given.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Okay. Is there a second?

MS. McGILVERY: Yes, I'll second that.

MR. BAIRD: Second.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Do you want fight over it?

Mr. Chairman, before you get your MS. BLAKE: second, if you haven't yet, I'd just like to draw your attention to the financial report that you get and is available on the website. Yes. This. The -- under the Expense and Revenue, which is in the bottom third of it, the OMH-approved fees that you see there, I'm looking at -- that are in this packet that I gave you talking about the fee increase, that 57,770, which are the fees that were brought in as revenue for the month of January, are a sum total of all the fees that are provided for you above that. So that you have the breakdown, how much of the fee was brought in from plan review and engineering, how much was brought in from permits, inspections, insignias, licensing. That's an actual breakdown for you. The HUD revenue is obviously money that we received from HUD for very specific purposes.

Revenues, we're dependent on Central

Page 51 -

Service Bureau to tell us what that is. And we can certainly get you that breakdown of what makes up the expenses for the month. And then the calculations for the estimated annual revenue and expenditures that we base that proration on are a mathematical calculation of the year-to-date revenue divided by the number of months this is reflected of times 12. Assuming if you're on this same target, this is where you're going to be.

So I guess I just need to make sure I clearly understand. I understand your request for wanting to know the breakdown of expenditures. But other than what's presented to you on this financial report, this is where the fees come from. So does this suffice for that? Because I don't know what else we could give you other than this from a revenue perspective.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Neal, if you had 12 months worth of these, would that answer your question? I mean, it doesn't give a detail of what the expenses are. It shows where that revenue comes from, but not expenses specifically.

MR. HANEY: Mr. Chairman, I -- I'll probably end up sticking my foot in my mouth if I talk much more.

You don't care?

CHAIRMAN WAIT: That choice is yours. No.

You're on this board for a specific reason.

MR. HANEY: I recently heard a report -- a study was done -- that this State is in dire financial straits and will be for the next five years. There is no clear answer. The one percent sales tax isn't the entire answer. I'm a little concerned for the overall fiscal responsibility certainly in your business, in Roger's business. I mean, you're businessmen. And my business and Sam's business.

I mean, we look at numbers very carefully, and we're able to read things. And we have some understanding of income and expense. We've talked for two years about having some sort of a cost analysis of what does certain things cost us as opposed to how much revenue does it bring in. Part of the cost of operating this office is the administration of the Relocation Fund. And that does have some expenses associated with it. There are -- when a property -- a community closes, there's income derived from that. And there's expenses associated with that.

And if we're going to -- if we as a board who has some responsibility for setting fee s for this agency, I think we ought to have a clear picture of what the at least overall income and expenses are. And, yes, this tells us what the fee income is. But that's not

-Page 53 -

```
all the income that comes into the coffers for this
1
   agency for all the expenses that they administer.
2
          CHAIRMAN WAIT:
                          Correct.
3
          MR. HANEY: And I think we should look at that --
4
          CHAIRMAN WAIT: And I understand.
5
          MR. HANEY: -- in its entirety.
6
          CHAIRMAN WAIT: Okay. We have a first and second
7
   on the floor. Any further discussion? All those in
8
9
   favor say "Aye."
                 (All responded "Aye.")
10
          CHAIRMAN WAIT: Any opposed? So moved.
11
                I've got to come back and ask a couple of
12
   questions. I know in years past if the revenue exceeded
13
   the expenditure, basically, it went into the General
1.4
15
   Fund, and they kept it.
16
          MS. BLAKE:
                      Yes.
          CHAIRMAN WAIT: So if -- if there was an extra
17
   hundred thousand for fiscal year 2010-11, would that
18
19
   just go into the General Fund?
          MS. BLAKE: Yes. All fees go into the General
20
21
   Fund. All expenses --
22
          CHAIRMAN WAIT: Come out of it.
          MS. BLAKE: -- are paid out of the General Fund
23
   with the exception of relocation.
24
```

CHAIRMAN WAIT: And that's a moving target at

25

this time subject to what's going to happen to the agency and all these other issues that are before us. Okay.

MS. BLAKE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: All right. Coming back to this, these numbers, except we're talking about we need to do -- your recommendation is we do a 15 percent in general increase in fees.

MS. BLAKE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Small other adjustments. So these numbers in this pink box at the bottom is what you're projecting for 2010-2011? Is that correct? Because that's what we're talk -- if we have to raise fees by sometime in May, they go into effect July 1. So is this what you're projecting for 2010-2011?

MS. BLAKE: No. Based on the information we know right now, if the fees were 15 percent higher for fiscal '10, which started on July 1 of last year --

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Uh-huh.

MS. BLAKE: -- instead of being at 89 percent proration, we would be --

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Would have been.

MS. BLAKE: -- we would have been -- thank you -- at '98. So, yes, assuming the industry is in the same position beginning July 1, there's no improvement,

there's no decline, then these figures would also be a projection for fiscal 2011.

what we're really talking about -- I know we've delayed voting on this until, let's say, sometime prior to May 11 -- excuse me -- May 15 -- that we are using really fiscal year 2010 numbers and saying if there's really no changes going forward to '11, that we need this 15 percent increase.

MS. BLAKE: Correct.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: But nothing is ever that static.

MS. BLAKE: Correct.

and, obviously, we still won't know about the one percent increase and what impact that might have -- do you see these -- when I do a budget -- and that's really what we're talking about, is doing a budget.

MS. BLAKE: Right.

Was. Because I just completed several budgets in November-December for 2010. Then you take -- closely look at 2010 and project is your business going to increase, going to decrease, you're going to do these things, and you tweak your budget, you've been tweaking your expenses, whatever you're doing, whether it's a

growth business or a declining business, and you do that.

Now, do you anticipate doing something like that for the upcoming year 2011 so that we would have an projection, a healthy projection?

MS. BLAKE: We can make some projections based on, you know, what the General Accounting Office tells us is projected growth --

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Or decline --

MS. BLAKE: -- or decline --

CHAIRMAN WAIT: -- or whatever.

MS. BLAKE: -- for the industry or market itself compared to the increased cost of doing business and expenses. We can ask for those percentages and give you a projection. It's still a "guesstimate" --

CHAIRMAN WAIT: I understand.

MS. BLAKE: -- based on what we know.

idea than the government itself, than Sam would, as to what he projects for the following 12 months for production? And, I mean, the people that are the head of the industry in this state, I guarantee you they have their own numbers. Is that going to be an increase or a decrease? I personally would rely more on their thought process than I would on some government employee who's

not really a distinct part of that industry who lives, eats and breathes by it. Because that's going to tell you what your income portion is, a majority of the income. Because if production goes up, then all revenues relative to this industry goes up or down.

MS. BLAKE: Correct.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: So to me, if we're trying to get a more focused idea on how we're going to be in Fiscal Year 11, I would think you'd be talking to Sam and to the industry in the State.

MR. PALMA: I agree with you wholeheartedly, Mr. Chairman. And, personally, I'm not using this as an excuse by any means. It's a fact. This is my first Board meeting here. I've been with this agency approximately three and a half weeks. I will personally assure you that the next Board meeting we will have this information in such a manner as you can readily refer to it in a much easier manner. Deb -- unfortunately, she's got so many things going that she does the best that she can.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: I understand.

MR. PALMA: But I personally understand where you're coming from, and Deb does, too. It's just matter of packaging it into such a manner, getting the information that you want, as you said, you know, that's

-Page 58 -

important in making the decisions that need to be made. And I agree with you wholeheartedly. Now, I did a cost analysis at Weights and Measures where we came down and broke down the cost for each program and all. So I know.

But let me keep you in mind that we're not management accountants by any means. But we do the best we can, because Deb knows her department, and staff she has knows basically how they do things and how much things cost. But, number one, it's you people and your staff that will help us come to some conclusion on the type of costs going forward once we settle with a benchmark.

And that's part of what my priority is here as Director is to try to set those kind of benchmarks so, going forward, we can at least, like you say, measure and say, "Okay. What happens in 2008 or '9 or '10 and go forward and do some forecasting.

I'm a person who ran their own business for 12 years and practiced law where you account for every darned minute of your time. So I know exactly where you're coming from, and I know how important costs are in terms of running your business. And I intend to bring that same kind of perspective to the department. All I ask is just for a little patience, and you'll be

1.4

receiving calls from our staff in terms of getting this thing together.

But we're definitely on the right track.

We're on the same page. All I ask of you is I don't -
I want to know what you expect from us. Because

sometimes there's an expectation gap in there. You

think we're bringing something, and we're bringing

something else. So maybe what we need to do is not even

in a board setting but in an informal --

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Workshop.

MR. PALMA: Just, "Hey, what is it that you want?" And if I can deliver, our staff will work on it, and we'll deliver it, considering the parameters of who we are and what we can do for you. But we're here to serve you and to serve what you need to have in terms of making a decision to go forward.

that, and that way we can, you know, personally -again, this is my first formal board government meeting.
I've been in corporate settings. And so I would like to
think that maybe the Board would be more productive in
making decisions going forward rather than -- and I
think you're perfectly right when you say some of these
numbers are ambiguous, to say the least. And I agree
with you. And I am personally not real comfortable with

them.

2.4

Unfortunately, that's what we have to work with right now. Part of my job is making sure that the numbers going forward are as solid as they can be. And that's the commitment you have from me and the rest of my staff. So let's try to, you know, again -- and we can't do this now, but, informally, see what it is you need, and we'll try to meet those needs for you. And information obviously is one of them as to numbers and such.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: I applaud your comments, and that's something, I think, that this Board has been striving for for quite some time, to be honest with you, blunt with you. And for us to be making financial decisions between 95 and 105 or anything else, we've got to have some serious numbers to deal with.

I would rely upon you from the expense side, but we would like some details on that as what's being requested. I would ask Sam to get together with the other people in the manufacturing industry in the State and help provide some projections for fiscal year -- the 2010-11 period, if you wouldn't mind, and getting those numbers to them, to the department.

And like Neal said, I would think it would be a relatively easy thing. Here's for the department

```
as it relates directly to OMH, and here's the Relocation
1
   Fund and here's these numbers, so we can look at it and
2
   see what's going on specifically. Even though it might
3
   not have any impact on how we raise fees or do it, we
4
   still need to have an understanding of how those fees
5
   come together. So what we need is enlightened numbers,
6
   numbers that people have given thought to, before the
7
   Board.
8
          MR. PALMA: I agree, Mr. Chairman,
9
   wholeheartedly. Again, I'm available 24 hours a day.
10
   You can e-mail me, call me, or just come in and visit,
11
   and I'll be more than happy to sit down with you and
12
   find out what it is you're looking for, what you need,
13
   and what we can do to fulfill that need. Because we are
14
15
   here to serve you.
          CHAIRMAN WAIT:
                          Thank you.
16
17
                Did you have a comment, Roger?
          MR. WENDT: I'll pass for now. Thank you.
18
19
          CHAIRMAN WAIT: Okay.
                      I have a question.
          MR. BAIRD:
20
21
          CHAIRMAN WAIT:
                          Please, Sam.
```

MR. BAIRD: Our mandate here is May 15. What is

MS. BLAKE: To establish fees for the new fiscal

22

23

24

25

year.

our mandate?

What if we decide we don't want to 1 MR. BAIRD: 2 commit? Then fees that are current are 3 MS. BLAKE: retained. 4 5 MR. BAIRD: Can we change those fees at any other 6 time other than May 15? 7 MR. HANEY: Not the way I read the statute. 8 CHAIRMAN WAIT: Let me broaden that question. Can we wait until at least May 19? 9 No. We were in that situation last 10 MS. BLAKE: year, Mr. Chairman. No. 11 It talks in the statute to establish 12 MR. PALMA: 13 a schedule of fees payable by persons, etcetera, etcetera, upon review of administrators so that the 14 total annual income derived from such fees will not be 15 less than 95 percent and not more than 105 percent of 16 17 the anticipated expenditures for the operation of the

19 Now, if your recall, it doesn't say anything about dates in the statute. In the rule it has 20 21 the date.

Office of Manufactured Housing.

18

24

25

22 CHAIRMAN WAIT: May 19 doesn't really play into 23 it anyway.

MR. BAIRD: What I was more concerned about was not May 19. What I was concerned about, in December if

```
all of a sudden we start industry doubling in production.
```

MR. HANEY: They're set for the fiscal year, sir.

MR. BAIRD: All that money we're just going to end up giving to General Fund or reverse of that.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Can we adjust it down mid-year is the question.

MR. BAIRD: Because we don't even know what the expected or projected expenses are for 2010.

MS. BLAKE: We would have to --

MR. PALMA: That's the whole thing about this.

12 It goes on anticipated.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. BLAKE: Right. We would have to get clarification and interpretation from the Attorney General's Office. I understand the statute to say you only get one shot a year for adjusting, and that's prior to May 15.

MR. PALMA: The statute says is that you will do

19 it.

MS. BLAKE: Shall.

MR. PALMA: Right. Rule states that the board shall establish a fee schedule before May 15 for the coming fiscal year. So that's in rule. So rule can be changed. But as it currently reads, you're to establish that fee that statute says you're going to set by May

15.

MR. DeSANCTIS: And Mr. Chairman, we don't even know if this will be allowed to be raised. We're just saying this is what we would like to do, but with any kind of a moratorium, obviously that --

CHAIRMAN WAIT: I guess we could always make it subject to certain conditions or changes. But, you know, the question is whether the sales tax increase goes through or not. I would have to agree with Gene's comment it will probably get moved to some other, quote, department. So I think we need to do that.

But coming back, though, if you anticipate a further seven percent of the -- none of us are going to know about this May 19 vote, which just means would it be here or get moved elsewhere. But, still, you're going to know or have a good idea if there's going to be a further seven percent cut, or is that seven percent cut purely contingent on the one percent sales tax would be my first question. Did you say seven percent for this coming year additional cut or additional 20 percent?

MR. PALMA: Twenty percent go from two million -yeah, we were getting a cut. We went from 2,185,000.
Then it was 2,062,000. Now the latest was 2,007,000
for an operating budget.

```
-Page 65 -
          MR. WENDT: If I understand it correctly, you're
1
   saying almost 20 percent of that comes from the General
2
   Fund?
3
          MS. BLAKE: No. Twenty percent of what?
                                                     I'm
4
5
   sorry.
6
          MR. PALMA: If you look at the offset, what's
   paid into the General Fund and what's taken out of the
8
   General Fund, yes.
          MR. WENDT: So 20 percent of whatever the number
9
   is here, 756,000, comes from the General Fund?
10
11
          MS. BLAKE: No.
          MR. WENDT: Okay. You guys can clarify that in
12
   the next meeting. But it's just got me spinning.
13
          CHAIRMAN WAIT: And we're talking two million.
1.4
   Yet we're talking about 756,000. So it's a little
15
   confusing.
16
              Sam.
          MR. BAIRD: How does one change the rule?
17
18
          MR. PALMA: Two million -- take it back -- is for
   the Fire Marshal's Office.
19
          CHAIRMAN WAIT: Oh. I figured it was.
20
          MS. BLAKE:
                      Right.
21
22
          MR. PALMA: So you have to extract -- what you
   want to do, you want to extract everything out of there,
23
   take the Fire Marshal's Office completely out of it.
2.4
   Because nothing from relocation or anything else is used
25
```

2.4

to offset the Office of State Fire Marshal. Then extract from that what percentages come from the actual relocation activities, what come from actual Office of Manufactured Housing and Office of Administration.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: So, again, coming back to here's our best guess for 2010 -- fiscal year 2011. Let me say it that way -- is this 756. But you're going to take a look at tweaking that. You're going to have to anticipate are we going to have a further decrease.

MS. BLAKE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: So that when we meet, we have a serious number to talk about, as good a guess as we can possibly come up with. Because that's what it is. Try to do as good a guess as you possibly can.

MS. BLAKE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Okay. Well, speaking of beating dead horses. Do you want beat it some more? Go ahead.

MS. McGILVERY: I just wanted to say how do you go about changing a rule?

MR. BARGER: You have to amend the rule through the rule process. You have to actually go through what we call a rule-making process. And there is a moratorium on rule-writing.

MS. McGILVERY: That answers that question.

MS. BLAKE: What a surprise.

MR. PALMA: To change a rule, Catherine -- it's easier to change a statute.

MR. HANEY: But not a lot.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Right now it's impossible.

MS. BLAKE: It's a process, Catherine. We have a rule packet ready that was going to move forward. And we actually had an independent person preparing that for us to take before the board that does that, the review committee. And then we got the moratorium from the Governor.

So we have a lot of changes in the rules. So if you have others as we look at this, like changing this date to establish fees, we can incorporate it. We just can't do anything with it right now.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Roger.

MR. WENDT: You guys may have forgotten some of this. But the rules we've changed here, Sam, over the last decade or so that Ross and I have been here take 18 months, two years.

MR. BAIRD: Once you get past the committees.

MR. WENDT: Even in regular times. By the time you go on from the Governor's Office, what do you call it? Curfew, they call it. It's excruciating.

MR. BAIRD: I just think the Board should have the ability to adjust the rates according to the

-Page 68 -1 expenditures. CHAIRMAN WAIT: Makes too much sense. 2 MR. PALMA: Well, it says you shall establish a 3 fee schedule. Whether you have to actually charge that 4 fee is another --5 MR. BAIRD: Everything a lawyer says is bad. 6 MR. PALMA: Well, that's immediately what came to 7 my mind is you can establish a fee schedule, but it 8 doesn't say you shall charge. I mean, it can be the 9 10 upper limit. MR. BAIRD: I see. 11 MR. PALMA: I made a note to myself to look at 12 13 that. MR. WENDT: Mr. Chairman, that's a great thought, 14 because we've set the fee schedule consistently for an 15 installation permit \$200, and the Director has chosen to 16 17 charge only 120. MS. BLAKE: Correct. 18 MR. WENDT: So that's usually possible in most of 19 20 these areas. MR. PALMA: I wanted to get an official 21 22 interpretation on that before I --

MR. WENDT: We've been doing that consistently for at least five years.

23

2.4

25

MR. HANEY: If I renewed my license in January

and had to pay 500 and you renewed yours in June and only had to pay 300, I'd be a little unhappy.

MR. WENDT: I'd give you a hundred.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: But to continue your thought process, we are, quote, mandated to keep it between 95 to 105. To truly do that really would be -- you'd have to be like a corporation. As you go along, you tweak things as they go along when they face reality.

MR. BARGER: That would be the reason behind it.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Yeah. In order to maintain that, we might need to reset fees up or down, you know, during the year to accomplish the mandate of 95 to 105.

MR. PALMA: You're right. And we may need some facilitating language in the rule or in the statute to allow for greater flexibility there. But, again, I'm willing to look at that and see what I can do on that end.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Okay. All right. Again, I believe we beat this horse to death.

All right. Next item on the agenda is
Recovery Fund. Fund balance and pending claims and cash
bond reconciliation update. I believe we've pretty much
covered that. And request by designate Ken Anderson as
an interested party in all Recovery Fund cases coming
for hearing at the Office of Administrative Hearings.

Catherine.

MS. McGILVERY: Why would we have somebody that's not on the Board do that?

CHAIRMAN WAIT: I think it makes perfect sense.

I think it makes perfect sense. Because Ken's position is probably a position-driven thing rather than Ken's name, so to speak, is they represent the industry that's putting the money into the fund and the money that's going out. Currently, there is no one going to these meetings. If I am the retailer who took \$800,000 and is sitting somewhere around Phoenix in my million dollar house smoking cigars, am I going to go to a hearing to say, "Hey, don't pay this out"? You're going to be low profile.

Ken in his position as president would be there to represent the industry, what's in the industry's best interests, in my opinion.

MR. HANEY: Does the designation "interested party" give him legal standing to argue?

MR. PALMA: No. That's where I was going to kind of take this. Because administrative hearing process is more of just a review of issues. And it's one of those things where you have the petitioner and the respondent, but the administrative law judge may allow people to sit in or may not. But you can't sit in as a participant to

represent one side or the other.

Now, if you have an attorney, which most of the times on the respondent's side they have an attorney representing them because they're the ones that are being challenged by the petitioner. The petitioners may or may not have somebody sit in on that.

Now, mostly on Recovery Fund, one party is out of business is why they went to the Recovery Fund hearing. So you have actually an issue where the petitioner has filed a petition, said that "The dealer went out of business. It cost me this much money to finish putting the house in. I've got three estimates on how much it's going to cost to finish the house," whether it was partially installed or whatever, present that at the hearing, and there's usually -- you're right -- nobody there on the other side to represent the respondent's side.

I don't think in an administrative hearing process that somebody can be designated to do that. But I think we'd have to look at that. I don't know.

MS. BLAKE: Mr. Chairman and Board, I was going to ask for clarification on that as well. Because I guess in my mind what I interpreted this to mean is that when we issue a Notice of Hearing for Recovery Fund cases, that Notice of Hearing tells about the amount of

money that's going to be -- that has been requested to be heard by the administrative law judge.

When we issue that Notice of Hearing, it's a public record. So we can certainly give a copy of that, as a matter of internal policy and procedure, to Ken or any other public member that wants it. And then if Ken sees something that makes him question whatever or he just wants to attend them, he could certainly go over there. But it's going to be up to the judge, I think is my understanding, whether or not he can speak to it or not. But at least he would be informed as to when it's going over, how much money.

And you all, of course, know that this comes from that one huge case where a consumer paid \$160,000 for a home and hit the Recovery Fund for -- what? 250 something. And really had requested 400,000 because she wanted attorney's fees.

And so that has to make sense, you know, from the Association's perspective, all of you, how do you get from what you paid for the house, padding it 100,000 or whatever it was. We don't get many of those. But it sure should send up a flag when we do.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Absolutely.

MS. BLAKE: And so I guess I just wanted to make sure, you know, from our perspective what it is you're

directing us to do. And if it is just get me a copy of all Recovery Fund Notice of Hearings, you know, that's something we certainly could do. But we don't have control over their processes over at the other office.

MR. BAIRD: I think what the board was looking for was somebody to represent Recovery Fund. I mean, there's a lot of people who think that there's nobody there but a person who thinks that they got taken advantage of and they're owed a bunch of money. There's nobody saying the other side. So you've got that person and the judge. And there's nobody representing the industry, the department, the Recovery Fund, the system. There's nobody there representing them.

That's what we were looking for, was, "Hey, wait a minute. You know, it doesn't cost \$50,000 to do this. We know it doesn't. So these estimates are way off," or something. And if you don't have that, you're just going to go through what we went through. We went through a million bucks here in 14 months.

MR. DeSANCTIS: Mr. Chair, Debra, is what I'm reading to request the Board would designate, we would actually make a motion? I mean, sounds like anybody could technically show up if forewarned or given notice.

MS. BLAKE: Yeah, I think so. I mean, this language came from the minutes from your September

```
REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - MARCH 17, 2010
                                                        -Page 74 -
  meeting where Ken as a public member requested that.
1
   wasn't agendized. So you all need to consider that.
2
   I'm not sure how the mechanics of it works.
3
          MR. HANEY: So this would really give him no
4
5
   legal standing.
          MS. BLAKE: It gives him no legal standing.
6
          MR. HANEY: And what he wants -- and as far as
7
   informing him, that could be done without any board
8
   action?
9
          CHAIRMAN WAIT: So there's --
10
          MS. BLAKE: Yes.
11
          CHAIRMAN WAIT: There is two things. You can at
12
   this point provide Ken with the information of any of
13
   these hearing cases. Is that what you said?
14
          MS. BLAKE:
                       Yes.
15
          CHAIRMAN WAIT: And that can be provided.
16
                 Is that something you would like to have
17
18
   your hands on, Ken?
          MR. ANDERSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
19
          CHAIRMAN WAIT: Next question I would have, is
20
   there some method that, like, Sam says, an advocate for
21
   the Recovery Fund can be present to speak on its behalf.
22
   I mean, is there any legal mechanism that would allow
23
```

MR. BARGER: Well, in our process because on

that to happen?

24

25

recovery fund, we do a -- we send an inspector out.

MS. BLAKE: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BARGER: So in that response, we send out a verification inspection. And that's what we verify to certain things in this process. That goes to hearing as part of the package. The AG represents this office in all issues concerning that. So that would cause -- if we were to go that route, then the RAG, which again is kind of a go-around circle now, we would have to request the AG's Office to attend every one of those hearings and have to educate them on everything that's going on.

Right. And I agree. I think from MS. BLAKE: our perspective, if we had any major hearing over there -- and we've had -- is that we would -- the department would provide witnesses, which in this case would be our complaints manager, who received the complaint, talks with the consumer, our inspector who goes out and verifies what the consumer's alleging or But we would have to be represented by legal not. counsel from the AG's Office, as Bob said, which is a challenge right now, because we don't pay them. even though they're mandated, they've had cuts. So if we need to go that route --

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Well, here's the thing. Coming back with this making something done, if someone says,

Page 76 **-**

all right, "I didn't receive my air conditioner."

Someone from the department goes out and verifies, no, there's no air conditioner. Let's say the air conditioner cost four grand. But this person has put in their quote 20. So would your person even be able to speak to that?

MS. BLAKE: Well, yes. Because what the department provides is exhibits. So we require a consumer to give us a copy of their purchase contract. So they know what the contractual obligations were. And then we send out somebody to verify that.

If they, in fact, didn't get their air conditioning unit and they did order it, then the burden falls on the consumer to get three quotes, kind of like the old days when you had to have your car worked on, three quotes from reputable businesses in Arizona of what it would cost so that the judge has that information to make his decision.

So we don't take it at face value. There is some investigation and documentation to support it. Could they still get away with stuff? Well, yeah.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Well, again, I'd like to come back and have staff take a look and see if there Is some way there could be an advocate, no matter who that is.

Is there any way an advocate on behalf of the Recovery

Fund could attend these meetings legally? I would like that to be looked into, to see if that's possible.

And after that last situation, I have, like, zero faith in the Attorney General's Office. When someone walks out the door with \$840,000 and won't even investigate it, as this guy walks scot-free. I find that dumbfounding.

Had you heard about that, Gene?

MR. PALMA: Yes, I've heard about that case, unfortunately. So I don't --

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Is it too late for you as an attorney, with your attorney background, to pursue that? I'm trying to get you a white hat.

MR. PALMA: Let me just emphasize that for the record I'm here in the capacity as Director and not attorney. And I'm not giving legal advice.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: No, I understand that.

MR. PALMA: But I would -- just from experience, I'm pretty positive that it would be up to the individual administrative judge on the case to allow somebody to advocate for a certain position who doesn't have standing in the case.

So that means basically Ken would have to put in a motion to appear on behalf just as an advocate, and then that judge would have to say, "I care" -- he

-Page 78 -

may just say, "You know what? Your brief explains your -- what do you call that? I'm sure you've heard of them -- amicus brief. Basically, you're not involved in the case, but you have an opinion on it. I would think they're more open to something like that than they would be to have somebody physically appear there and give an oral argument.

But I'm not sure. I'd be more than happy, and Deb and I could submit that question for further research. But I'm pretty sure that would be a tough sell.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Well, I think if the -- you know, if we are able to get everything run through a title company, meaning a true trust account, and anything over 50,000, that's going to take a lot of pressure off this process.

MR. PALMA: Yes. Hopefully.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: That legislatively that will take place and move that forward to reduce that overall risk to that Recovery Fund.

MR. BARGER: That was consideration for the new legislation and everything. That whole process.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Okay. I'm sorry, Catherine.

MS. McGILVERY: Would it be proper to make a motion that we kind of table this until we get some more

information back?

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Well, I think it's just a case we'll carry it over to the next meeting. I'm not sure it needs a motion to do so.

MS. McGILVERY: Oh, all right.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: We'll just carry it over to the next meeting while staff does some research on that.

Okay. Bonding requirements. That's just an ongoing standing item. Like I've just said, that if we could get a legislative change and have true trust accounts in place, that would do a lot to, quote, protect that Recovery Fund. Then it would be, quote, protecting those people that have less than a \$50,000 purchase. Anybody else have any comments regarding bonding?

Okay. Call to the public? Ken, please.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman and members of the Board, thank you. Perhaps I can clarify my point about being an entrusted party. Not so much to testify at a hearing, because I understand there are restraints on that. But to report back to the Director of any impropriety that I might see in the documentation.

For example, the one case that we referred to, quarter of a million dollars loss, I'm going to read one paragraph. "The demolition and regrading of the

property will destroy petitioner's front landscaping.

Petitioner originally requested only the amount that she paid, which was \$3,500. However, at the hearing she provided an estimate from one licensed landscaper showing \$1,646 for replacement. The estimate from the licensed contractor is found to be the best assessment of petitioner's damages and so awarded."

If I see a large case, my point is I would report back to the Director and say, "Mr. Director, you have so many days to appeal this ruling. Let's take another look at it if we can and go from there."

When he appeals that decision at that point, the finding is withheld until the appeal process goes through. So that's my intent.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Sure.

MS. BLAKE: But who would -- Ken, excuse me. Who would appeal it? Because, typically, the retailer is not there.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ ANDERSON: It would be the Director that would have to.

MS. BLAKE: I don't think the Director has the authority. He doesn't have the authority.

MR. ANDERSON: I saw it in the statutes.

MS. BLAKE: Well, he has the authority to accept, reject, or modify decisions that come from the Office of

Administration with the exception of Recovery Fund and when we used to do Homeowner Association cases. Those are taken at face value, and then the Director is directed, or the Board, to pay the amount that the judge awards. I don't think there's an appeal process on that.

MR. ANDERSON: I think that's something we should look at. Because as I recall, there was a 60-day appeal process where the judge's findings were set aside during the appeal process.

And that's my only point. Because if it's a small amount, I'm not going to be there. But if it's another \$250,000, I'm probably going to be there.

MS. BLAKE: And I think the appeal thing you're talking about, there is a 30-day appeal process. But the only individuals who can appeal are the parties. So the retailer, who's typically out of business, can appeal it. They have at times, I think. Or if the consumer wasn't happy with the award, they can appeal it. But I don't believe the Director has the authority.

MR. ANDERSON: I think that's where the interested party language steps back in again.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Okay. We'll research that.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: See if there's any possibility of

doing that. Thank you.

2.4

Anyone else from the public? All right.

MS. HOLT: I would like to introduce myself.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Sure.

MS. HOLT: My name is Kara Holt. And it's great to be here. And I just want to thank you all for including me. And I guess, you know, I'm in sales. I represent resale brokers. And the best thing we can do is sell homes. That's what we need to do. We need to sell homes.

You know, I've been in the industry for 20 years, and I just want to work with everybody, network and coordinate, so we can get the financing that we need. I mean, that's it is biggest thing. We need to be able to get financing, to get financing for our customers, so we can have more production at CAVCO or wherever. And we need the parks to keep their space rent low so that people will continue to buy in the parks so we can --

You know, the thing is that a lot of the income expense issues that you're talking about, we're talking about variable and fixed expenses. There are fixed expenses that are associated with salaries, etcetera. But all the variables are the license fees. If people go out of business, you're not going to be

Page 83 -

getting any license fees, any new sales people, etcetera. So, anyway, I'm just here to join together as an industry and figure out a way to solve this.

The other thing I want to comment on, it sounds to me like there's a discovery process that happens through the original complaint hearing. So when it makes sense, maybe that would be available to look at some of that data prior to the hearing so you could prepare ahead of time to see if there was any discrepancy and some of the material that was being provided in the complaint process. Then, you know, you'd be kind of prepared ahead of time. Rather than having it have to be an appeals process, you'd be prepared at the time of the hearing. Anyway, just an idea.

And then one last thing, on the budget thing earlier we were talking about, I think that on that first section when you were trying to figure out whether it was 15 -- like 12,000, which was 75 percent of the 15 on this first page up in monthly summary report, the total expenditures are subtracted from the prior year interest. Right? So the remaining balance is 4,559, is 75 percent of the remaining balance. So that's where the 75 percent comes from. Right? You were trying to figure out --

MR. HANEY: It's all mislabeled.

MS. HOLT: Yeah. No. I know. But I'm saying the reasoning behind it, it seemed like that was kind of being missed. Anyway, I think that's what you meant; right?

No. It was the discussion between you two. You were talking about if this prior year interest of 15,679, and you were trying to figure out 75 percent of that for education. But it wasn't. You have to subtract expenses from that before you calculate the 75 percent of the remaining. So that's where that figure came from. And it just seemed like that was getting missed when you guys were talking.

MS. BLAKE: I think Neal made a great point, though, and that is that we need to represent the numbers right. The numbers are right. They're labeled wrong. And when you calculate 75 percent off of the interest and then minus deductions; then you come up with --

MS. HOLT: Expenses.

MS. BLAKE: -- a running total. And we just need to do it differently.

MS. HOLT: Thank you for letting me speak.

CHAIRMAN WAIT: A pleasure. Thank you.

All right. Next meeting date would be May

```
Page 85
1
   something.
2
         MS. BLAKE: Before May 1.
          MR. PALMA: You mean we have to do this again?
3
          MR. HANEY: Typically, it would be May 19, but we
4
5
   have to have a special meeting before that.
          CHAIRMAN WAIT: We have to do it sometime prior
6
7
   to May 15. So --
          MR. HANEY: That will be -- the 19th is a
8
9
   Wednesday?
10
          CHAIRMAN WAIT: Yeah. So can we move it up one
11
   week to the --
12
          MR. BAIRD: Monday's the 10th.
          CHAIRMAN WAIT: How about we just move to it
13
14
   Wednesday before? I'm just suggesting.
15
          MR. BAIRD:
                      That's the 12th.
          MR. HANEY: Be the 12th?
16
17
          MR. BAIRD: I'm okay.
                      May 12?
18
          MR. WENDT:
19
          CHAIRMAN WAIT: Yeah. I don't have my calendar
20
   with me.
21
          MR. GIBB: Here's one.
22
          CHAIRMAN WAIT: No. That won't help me.
23
          MR. GIBB: Oh, yours.
2.4
          CHAIRMAN WAIT: Yeah.
25
          MS. BLAKE: Wednesday, May 12?
```

CHAIRMAN WAIT: Yes. Just do it the week earlier 1 2 and meet that May 15. MR. WENDT: And the only item on that agenda will 3 4 be the fees? 5 MS. BLAKE: That was my question. Is that the only item you want on that agenda, the fees? 6 CHAIRMAN WAIT: Well, there were several other 7 questions that have been raised in this meeting that 8 9 will be on that agenda also. MR. HANEY: Perhaps some of that information 10 11 could be gotten out to us. 12 CHAIRMAN WAIT: As soon as you have it. MS. BLAKE: So you want a full board meeting with 13 all the action items on the agenda we talked about 14 15 today. Okay. 16 CHAIRMAN WAIT: Gene had such a good time this 17 time, he wants to do it again as soon as possible. MR. PALMA: I was hoping we could get together 18 19 next week. 20 CHAIRMAN WAIT: All right. I'd entertain a motion to adjourn. 21 l 22 MR. HANEY: So moved. CHAIRMAN WAIT: He's anxious on that one. 23 24 there a second?

MR. BAIRD: Second.

25

```
-Page 87 -
           CHAIRMAN WAIT: All right. All those in favor
1
2
   can walk.
                  Thank you, everybody, for being here.
3
                  (The proceedings concluded at 2:53 p.m.)
 4
5
 6
8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

Γ	Page 88
1	STATE OF ARIZONA)) SS.
2	COUNTY OF MARICOPA)
3	CERTIFICATE
4	BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were taken
5	before me, DOREEN C. BORGMANN, RMR, CRR, Certified
6	Reporter, Certificate No. 50644, State of Arizona; that
7	the proceedings were taken down by me in shorthand and
8	thereafter reduced to computer print under my direction;
9	that the foregoing 87 pages constitute a true and
10	correct transcript of all proceedings had upon the
11	taking of said proceedings, all done to the best of my
12	skill and ability.
13	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any
14	of the parties hereto, nor am I in any way interested in
15	the outcome hereof.
16	DATED at Phoenix, Arizona, this 31st day of March,
17	2010.
18	
19	A Baren 121
20	DOREEN C. BORGMANN, RMR, CRR
21	Certified Reporter Certificate No. 50644
22	CCICILICACC NO. 50044
23	
24	
25	